

Tentative Program for Archeological Research at Fort Frederick, Md.

Fort Frederick was part of a chain of forts built along the western frontiers of the British Colonies in America during the French and Indian War of the mid-18th century. Its imposing remains, relative isolation, and historical obscurity have made it an object of curiosity for over a century. Interest in preserving, restoring, and reconstructing the fort culminated in restoration of the fort walls and some minor reconstruction during the 1930's. Before additional reconstruction is undertaken, it is imperative that thorough historical, archeological, and architectural investigations are made. Inadequate research may result in serious misrepresentations, a waste of money, and, in the case of archeology, actual destruction of irreplaceable historical and archeological data. The present report attempts to indicate the nature of the historical and archeological data which are already available for Fort Frederick and to suggest a program for additional research.

Early Descriptions of Fort Frederick

The following data have been gathered from readily available printed archives and histories. Except as noted, all sources known to have been consulted by previous writers have been reviewed. In order to be as explicit as possible about the nature of the available historical data describing the original appearance of Fort Frederick, relevant passages from all original sources are quoted in full (except for a few which duplicate those quoted).

Most writers assert or suggest that Gov. Horatio Sharpe personally planned Fort Frederick (e.g., Brown 1923: 102; Porter 1936: 1; Scharf 1882, vol. 2: 1296), but the evidence is entirely circumstantial. Late in May, 1756, Sharpe wrote to Calvert that he was " . . . preparing to set off for the Frontiers to . . . construct a strong Fort on the North Mountain at least to oversee for a while & put the Officers in such a way & give them such Directions as will enable them to compleat it in the best manner & render it most defensible; This Journey of mine I think the more necessary as Engineers or persons of Military Experience & Skill are not to be found in this part of the World & as Fort Cumberland & little places of Defence that have been built in the two Neighboring Colonies are by no means such as I would have built on the Frontiers of this Province" (Archives, vol. 6: 423). Sharpe also wrote to his brother: "I intend to proceed to the Frontiers next Monday or Tuesday to give Orders about constructing the Fort & Block Houses that are to be built there, & as the Officers are all Novices I believe I shall tarry there with them three Weeks or a Month . . ." (Archives, vol. 6: 430). Sharpe apparently arrived at the site about June 8 (S. Hamilton 1898: 283-3, 285). In mid-July he wrote to Lord Baltimore that " . . . My presence here will I apprehend be absolutely necessary till the Work is pretty far advanced all our Men being raw & undisciplined & all our Officers ignorant of every thing that relates to Fortifications or Places of Defence . . ." (Archives, vol. 6: 452). Sharpe finally returned to Annapolis in mid-August, and in a letter written a month later to his brother he says "As soon as some Barracks were finished for the Accomodation of the Garrison; & the other Works raised enough to cover the Men & to give the Officers an Idea of what I would have done, I took my Leave of them & returned hither the 16th of last month . . ." (Archives, vol. 6: 485).

During the same summer that Sharpe was overseeing the construction of Fort Frederick, Col. George Washington was building Fort Loudoun at Winchester, Virginia, about 35 miles to the south. Sharpe states that Washington visited him at Fort Frederick (Archives, vol. 6: 468), and a number of writers have suggested that Washington may have had some hand in the planning of the fort (Porter 1936: 1; Scarborough 1931). Evidence of Washington's influence is said to be found in the similar outlines of the bastions, the design of the entrances, and the presence of two interior wells at both Fort Frederick and Fort Loudoun (Anonymous, 1924). However, the forms of both forts are characteristic of the period and, as we will see later on, there was only one well inside Fort Frederick. One writer asserts that Fort Frederick was designed by a Ridout of Anne Arundel County who was a nephew of John Ridout, Secretary of State under Sharpe, but no supporting data are given or cited (McKinsey 1941).

Gov. Sharpe seldom provides any descriptions with his frequent references to the fort, and when he does they are tantalizingly brief. ^(mid August) Soon after his return to Annapolis, Sharpe wrote to Calvert explaining that "As I apprehended that the French would e'er long teach their Indian Allies to approach and set fire to our Stoccado or Wooden Forts I thought proper to build Fort Frederick of Stone. . . . The Fort is not finished but the Garrison are well covered & will with a little Assistance compleat it at their leisure" (Archives, vol. 6: 466). To Gov. Dinwiddie of Virginia he wrote "We face the Bastions & Curtains with Stone & shall mount on each of the Bastions a Six pounder. The Barracks will receive & lodge very commodiously 200 Men beside Officers & on Occasion near twice that number. I do not know whether our Commissioners will have Money enough to compleat it agreeable to my Plan" (Archives, vol. 6: 469). In late September he

wrote to the Lower House: "In compliance with your Request, I send you a Plan of Fort-Frederick, and a Letter from Capt. Beall, whence you may learn what are the dimensions of that Fort, and what Forwardness it is in. . .

I apprehend such a Fort as I have directed to be constructed on the North-Mountain, will not be compleated for less than £5000. From the Agents Accounts you may learn how much has been already expended thereon, and the Plan and Letter abovementioned will shew you what Work . . . yet remains to be executed!" (Archives, vol. 52: 615-6). The plan referred to, or any other, has not been located, but we do have Capt. Alexander Beall's letter dated at Fort Frederick on September 10, 1756: "Yours of the 6.th Capt. Dagworthy has received and thro' his Illness Requested me to acquaint you, . . . the Gorges of the Bastions, will be Inclosed with the utmost Expedition the Curtain Lines is carry'd on as follows. the North West with Timber Seven feet and an half high, the North East with Timber Six feet high, the South west with Stone one half Seven and half feet high the other part four and an half feet high, the South East five feet high to the Gate, and half way from the Gate Eastward the Same Heighth. . . . Have this Day Engaged Some more Carpenters and expect some Masons from Lancaster on Monday next, and is now about getting the Stoccades have about thirty thousand Bricks Moulded, . . . the South East Curtain is now carried to the End the Timbers are ready for the Officers Barracks!" (Archives, vol. 52: 617).

Some inferences about the appearance of the fort can be made from the relative **costs** of various items in the following account (Archives, vol. 55: 612):

The Public for Building a Fort, and Supporting 200 Men
on the Western Frontier till 10th Feb. 1757.

Dr.

To Error in Debit Side of former Account,	70	0	0
To Carpenters for Work done at the Fort,	69	3	6
To Waggon Hire at Ditto,	68	9	9
To Masons Work at Ditto,	21	12	9
To Sawyers Work at Ditto,	11	0	0
To Nails for the Fort	40	5	4
To Labourers Wages at Ditto, , , ,	1	10	9
To Provisions for Workmen at Ditto, , ,	47	16	3
To 1 empty Hogshead,	0	10	0
To Charges attending the Service	11	16	0
To Balance in Agents Hands unexpended,	153	17	3

£ 496 1 7

The original appropriation for the Fort, made in May, 1756, was supplemented with additional funds in October, 1756 (Archives, vol. 6: 494-5). Over a year later it seems that the fort was still not completed because in December, 1757, the House of Delegates notified Sharpe that

["Near the Sum of £6000 has been expended in purchasing the Ground belonging to and containing Fort Frederick; and tho' we have not any exact Information what Sum may still be wanting to compleat it, (if ever it shall be thought proper to be done) yet we are afraid the Sum requisite for that Purpose, must be considerable, and we are apprehensive that Fort is so large, that in Case of Attack, it cannot be defended without a Number of Men larger than this Province can support, purely to maintain a Fortification" (Archives, vol. 55: 359).

Fort Frederick was used as a supply depot during preparations for the Forbes campaign in 1758, and in April of that year St. Clair, quartermaster general of the British forces in America, notified Sharpe that he had given some money to Lieut. Bassett to ". . . repair the Magazines [sic, plural] at Fort Frederick" (Archives, vol. 9: 169). By the end of 1758, probably somewhat earlier, the Fort was no longer garrisoned (Archives, vol. 9: 319; Procter 1936: 243). An official communication to England in December, 1761, states "There are two Forts in the Western part of this Province on Potomack River, one Called Fort Frederick and the other Fort Cumberland, the former is far the Strongest, its exterior Lines being 120 yards, the Curtain and Bastions are faced with a thick stone wall, and it Contains Barracks for 300 men, but it is not at this time garrisoned . . ." (Archives, vol. 32: 25).

About a year after it was last garrisoned it was decided to lease the land and fort ". . . so as to preserve the House [sic, singular] already built thereon . . ." (Archives, vol. 31: 418). According to a secondary source, an unrecorded lease of the fort and property was made to Henry Heinzman on December 25, 1762 (Stockbridge 1895: 754). The lease states that ". . . there is not any garrison or soldiers at the said Fort Frederick, and several persons who live at or near the said fort do, and if not prevented, will continue to make great waste and destruction of the said fort and improvements by burning the plank and other materials" (quoted by Stockbridge 1895: 754).

The fort occasionally served as a stopover for traders or militia (Stevens and Kent, series 21647: 59; series 21650, pt. 2: 100), and during Pontiac's uprising in 1763 Sharpe ordered that arms be returned to the fort and that it be made available as a place of refuge for the western settlers. Sharpe notified ". . . Doctor Heinzman (who having been

Surgeon to the Maryland Troops has for some time lived at & taken Care of the Fort) . . . " and " . . . whose Care the Keys of the Fort were Committed to admit them into it on Condition that they do not in any respect injure the Buildings . . . " (Archives, vol. 14: 100; vol. 32: 60). Several hundred persons are said to have sought refuge in the fort during August (Archives, vol. 14: 114; Brown 1931: 3), but by the end of the summer the fort's arms were sent to Annapolis and placed in storage (Archives, vol. 58: 395).

On December 16, 1777, the Revolutionary War Office requested Col. Moses Rawlings to inspect Fort Frederick and to report on needed repairs and other matters relating to its preparation for use as a prison for British soldiers (Stockbridge 1895: 862). Rawlings' reply was acknowledged by the War Office (Stockbridge 1895: 862), and a notice was sent to Annapolis (Archives, vol. 16: 453). Unfortunately, the reply was not found during the course of preparing the present paper, but its potential for revealing details about the fort make it a prime object for future investigation. (Stockbridge does not give the source of his information about Rawlings, but the Papers of the Continental Congress at the Library of Congress and the Rawlings papers in the Maryland Historical Society should be searched.) On December 20, 1777, the Council in Annapolis notified the War Office that "The Fort and Barracks are much out of Repair and will require a good Deal of Work to put them in proper Order to receive Prisoners, but no Time shall be lost" (Archives, vol. 16: 439). On December 22 the Council engaged Samuel Hughes to put the ". . . Fort Frederick Barracks in Repair, for the Reception of Prisoners. . . We shall be much obliged to you to employ Workmen immediately to do it. The Gap in the Wall made by Pindell, must be made up again and,

as we are informed, Doors and Windows will be wanted as well as some Plank for the Floors. They need only be done in a rough way. M^r Denton Jacques told the Governor that he believed his and Kempner's Mills could soon furnish the Plank necessary . . . Great Expedition is necessary and therefore we wish a sufficient Number of Workmen to be hired" (Archives, vol. 16: 443-4). The repairs were completed sometime after March 27, 1778 (Archives, vol. 16: 506, 545, 555) and Hughes was paid 570 pounds, 9 pence on June 16, 1778 (Archives, vol. 21: 137). Rawlings was placed in charge of the Fort Frederick prison in March, 1778, and he experienced great difficulties in obtaining food and supplies because the local residents would not accept government credit or currency. In December, 1780, he wrote to Gov. Lee " . . . my Situation here is Truly alarming, for the prisoners really suffer for water as well as meat, for the wells Both in & out of the fort are Dry, so that we Have water to fetch near Half a mile . . . the Prisoners attempted the other night to Force the gate but were prevented from getting out by the alertness of the guard . . . " (Archives, vol. 45: 199). According to one historical account some prisoners escaped by digging under the walls, but no documentation is cited (Williams 1905). In May, 1781, 859 prisoners (described as "men, women, children, and sailors") were transferred to Fort Frederick, and it was reported to Gov. Lee that Rawlings lacked provisions or prospect of " . . . getting any repairs or additions made to the Barracks, as he is without Tools and unable to Procure workmen" (Archives, vol. 47: 254, 257). Additional prisoners were sent following Cornwallis's defeat at Yorktown in October 1781 (Fitzpatrick 1925: 269-70; 1931-34; vol. 23: 263), and the Council in Annapolis notified Rawlings that "To enable you to provide for the Prisoners with their Guards we hereby authorize you to impress or seize, if not to be procured otherwise, all Articles necessary

to repair the Barracks and other Houses for the immediate Reception of them. The Guards and every Workman that can be got, ought to be employed in this Business, as well as the Prisoners" (Archives, vol. 45: 665).

Two items of interest appear in a statement submitted to the government by Rawlings: "To cash paid two of British prisoners for cleaning and repairing well outside fort, £12 7s. 6p. To cash paid two British prisoners for daubing and underpinning barracks, £12 7s. 6p." (quoted by Stockbridge 1895: 865).

It should be noted that in 1777 some stone barracks were constructed at Frederick, 35 miles southeast of Fort Frederick, and used as a prison until the end of the war in 1783 (Steiner 1902: 49-50). The Frederick Barracks should not be confused with Fort Frederick.

Subsequent to the Revolution available descriptions of the fort become increasingly vague and secondary. An unspecified early 19th century source states that "Its walls are entirely of stone, four and a half feet thick at the base, and three at the top. They are at least twenty feet high, and have undergone but little dilapidation. . . . It encloses an area of about one and a half acres exclusive of the bastions or redoubts" (quoted by Williams 1906: 41). An historian gives an early eyewitness account: "When the writer saw it, in the summer of 1828, the greater part of it was still standing, and in a high state of preservation in the midst of cultivated fields" (McMahon 1831: 305). According to historian J. T. Scharf, an elderly resident of Indian Springs (located about 3 miles north of Fort Frederick) recalled that "Early in this century she went to attend religious services in the fort, which was then a favorite stopping-place for Methodist itinerants bound to the West. At that time, not later than 1820, the barracks, which were substantial stone structures, were still standing, and the longest of them

was known as the Governor's house. John Forsythe lived in the fort, and was the last survivor of the generation who had known it in the days of the Revolutionary war" (Scharf 1882, vol. 2: 1297; an anonymous newspaper article published in 1881, probably written by Scharf, carries the same account under the subtitle, "Gossip of the Past"). Another account states that "When the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was built [1828-50] within a quarter of a mile of it, a portion of the fort's wall was taken to construct a lock" (L. Hamilton 1898). Other writers say that stones from the barracks were used in the canal construction (MacLachlan 1956; Mish 1956: 124; Fort Frederick Bicentennial Commission 1956). And others state that the barracks burned between 1790 and the Civil War (Greene 1967). Nearly all post-Civil War historical accounts of Fort Frederick state that it was occupied by part of the Maryland First Regiment in 1861 during the Civil War when a breach was made in the south curtain west of the gate, but documentation is never provided. During the winter of 1861-62 several skirmishes are reported to have occurred in the vicinity of the fort (Camper and Kirkley 1871: 26). Further destruction of the fort is said to have occurred in the mid-1800's when the northwest bastion was partly demolished and a barn was erected on its lower part (Brown 1929: 177; 1931: 3; Scharf 1882, v. 2: 1298). Stones were removed from the east and west walls to use in the foundations of several dwellings in the area (Stockbridge 1914).

A visitor to the fort about 1898 wrote as follows: "Inside the fort we wandered over two or three acres of uneven turf; one loosely boarded-over well remained; of the other there was no sign. A dancing pavilion stood back towards the rear wall . . ." A barnyard " . . . occupies the place of the demolished fourth bastion . . ." (L. Hamilton 1898). Another visitor to the fort in about 1910 relates: "Entering

the farmyard, I passed the barn, whose east wall is part of the west wall of the fort, . . ." the owner ". . . tearing down the entire west bastion and building his barn against the wall. The huge gates were in the east wall of the fort . . . At this time nearly all of the wall of the fort is standing and in such fair condition as to be well worth preserving, a wagon gate cut through the west curtain and the loss of the west bastion being the greatest damage to the structure. The woodwork has entirely vanished--I understand through the earnest endeavor of relic and curiosity seekers for spoil" (Mason 1910; the directions are confused in this narrative the original gate being in the south wall and the later "wagon gate," as shown on the 1934 archeological map, being in the north wall).

The earliest known pictorial representations of Fort Frederick are small sketches lacking detail. A pen and ink drawing, said to have been made by E. E. Mayer in 1858, shows the walls of the fort in rather ruined condition; the barracks are not visible (Bowie 1945: f.p., 194; Enoch Pratt Free Library, Maryland Dept., vertical file; also reproduced in Scharf 1879, vol. 1: 491; 1882, vol. 2: 1298; Kaessmann and others 1955: 147). A small distant view published in an 1872 history text shows two buildings towering above the walls of the fort, an obviously fanciful reconstruction (Onderdonk 1872: 90). An early photograph showing the exterior of one curtain and a bastion in the background is reproduced by Williams (1906, vol. 1: f.p. 40).

A problem which appears to have been largely ignored by previous investigators, with the exception of a passing comment (Mish 1956: 123), is the extent to which the fort, as originally planned, was ever completed. In a previous section of this report (pp. 2-5) documents are quoted which indicate how the fort was to be built and that progress was being made, but no statement suggesting that it was finished has been found. On the contrary, a year and a half after the fort was begun it was still not complete and doubt was expressed that it was necessary to finish it. A year later Fort Frederick was no longer garrisoned. The tacit and widely accepted assumption that each of the bastions supported a six pound cannon, for example, is apparently based on how Sharpe envisioned the completed fort. No evidence has been found indicating that the cannon were actually mounted, although the discovery of some six pound cannon balls in the southwest bastion is comforting. Beall's letter (quoted on p. 4) suggests that the bastions were to be completed first, but that a great deal more work remained to be done on the curtains at the time he wrote in September, 1756. Perhaps the ragged condition of the tops of the curtains early in this century should not be entirely attributed to vandalism and weathering.

Early Efforts at Preservation and Restoration

Popular interest in preserving Fort Frederick began as early as 1881 (Anonymous 1881), and official interest was expressed by the State in 1892 (Brown 1923: 106). When the fort was eventually re-purchased by the State in 1922 (it had been sold in 1791), the terms of the agreement included removal of the barn which rested on the northwest bastion (Brown 1929: 180). In 1927 " . . . the foundations of the original buildings [were] uncovered and marked with monuments at the corners (W. McC. 1927). The well inside the fort was restored in 1930 (McKinsey 1941). Extensive restoration was begun in 1934 with the aid of the Civilian Conservation Corps. As the work was beginning, it was noted that " . . . each year freezing and thawing result in dislodgment of great numbers of stone from the top of the wall. Only the foundations of the barracks and other buildings which stood within the walls can now be traced and it is hoped that excavation and research may make known the type of buildings which once existed" (W. J. Q. 1934: 1).

The Archeological and Historical Investigations of the 1930's.

In a joint effort from 1934 to 1937 the Maryland State Department of Forestry, the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the National Park Service undertook restoration of the fort walls, the northwest bastion and a portion of the catwalk; the foundations of former buildings were built up to ground level and capped (Porter 1936).

The historical research seems to have relied heavily on secondary sources although an intensive but fruitless search was made for the original plan of the fort, and the existence of the 1756 letter by Beall (quoted on p. 4) was noted for the first time.

The term "archeology" must be used advisedly with reference to most of the digging carried out by the Civilian Conservation Corps in 1934 at Fort Frederick, as it appears to have been primarily directed at uncovering building foundations. When Dr. Charles W. Porter was appointed assistant Regional Historian for the National Park Service in June 1935, the archeological work had been completed but no record had been made of where the artifacts were found. Porter attempted to remedy the situation by having the same workmen who excavated the artifacts record the approximate locations in which they were found, but the catalog which relates the artifacts to a map has now been misplaced. Porter also opened some additional trenches, but neither his trenches ~~nor~~ the earlier ones are indicated on the archeological plans preserved in the Division of History, National Park Service, Washington, D. C. No field notes or detailed photographs of the excavations have been found. According to a newspaper article, 10 inches of topsoil were removed and sifted in the 1 1/2 acre interior of the fort, and 10 miles of trenches were dug in and around the fort (Musgrave 1937). Fortunately, we do have a short but informative progress report by Porter, his maps of artifact locations, and a measured plan of the fort prepared at the end of 1934 which includes a few cross sections and some explanatory notes on the archeology.

The excavations within the fort revealed the stone foundations of three large buildings, each with a different floor plan. Both of the east and west buildings measure about 18 by 117 feet and contain four H-shaped stone footings for double fireplaces. Ancillary structures near the east structure, inferred to be barracks, are a well at the north end and two detached footings of unknown purpose near the southwest corner. The west structure is considerably more complex than the east structure.

Its fireplace footings are relatively narrow and have hearth supports. There are several unexplained ancillary structures on the east side of the west building including a detached footing near the southeast corner in the same relative position as one of the detached footings near the southwest corner of the east building. Another structure on the east side of the west building is a "single course brick paving" covering a rectangular area measuring 2 1/2 by 5 feet; adjacent is an irregular area of "loose stone." Another feature consists of a surface deposit of "debris-brick." The fourth structure near the west building is a "drain and catch-basin." The main west structure is labeled "mess hall" on the archeological map prepared by Porter. The north structure, or officers' quarters, measures 28 by 96 feet and the foundations indicate a large central room and two quartered wings. Footing for a large four-sided fireplace were found in the east wing; the absence of fireplace footings in the west wing suggest that it may have been used for storage. A note on the 1934 archeological plan states: "The barrack foundations are rather narrow and were originally all brought to about the same grade and leveled off. This would probably indicate log structures." Porter was inclined to believe that the letter written by Beall (quoted earlier in this report) also indicated the presence of log superstructures and brick chimneys. Many secondary historical sources state that the barracks were made of stone, but there appears to be no support for this suggestion in the original 18th century sources. The earliest reference to stone barracks at Fort Frederick which has been found appears in a newspaper under the subheading "Gossip of the Past" (Anonymous 1881). The account was reprinted in the widely distributed and quoted "History of Western Maryland" by Scharf (1882, vol. 2: 1297).

A fourth stone foundation was found " . . . just outside the northwest bastion," and by comparison with the plan of Fort Cumberland Porter suggests that it may have been the hospital or commissary (Porter 1936: 4). No documentary evidence for such a structure at Fort Frederick is known. Rather curiously, Porter's archeological map does not show this structure, and it is not mentioned in recent secondary sources or in current literature distributed to visitors at the park. Possibly at the time Porter made his report in October, 1936, he was not aware that a 19th century barn had been removed from this area about 1923. It is also possible that the barn made use of an earlier foundation.

The remains of a log cabin foundation measuring 12 by 18 feet were found near Big Pool Road 2100 feet north of the fort; remains of another structure were found 500-feet northwest of the log cabin. The significance of these structures is not known, but they probably do not relate to the fort.

The excavations also revealed a "thin layer of decayed wood" in the centers of the northeast and southwest bastions, and some "shale over decayed wood" near the south edge of the northeast bastion (1934 archeological map); no interpretation of these features is offered.

The absence of any features which could be interpreted as latrines or refuse pits is very puzzling, especially if the excavations were as thorough as the scanty records suggest.

A number of historians have asserted or implied that the curtains and the bastions were strengthened with earthen embankments (e.g., Lowdermilk 1878: 197; Scharf 1862, vol. 1: 97; Williams 1906: 41), and this may seem to be implied in Sharpe's frequently cited letter to Dinwiddie in which he says "We face the Bastions and Curtains with Stone . . ." (Archives, vol. 6: 469). On the other hand, the construction of the stone walls themselves imply otherwise: the bastions

are 4 feet thick at the base and batter on the exterior to 3 feet at the top; the curtains are three feet thick and not battered. According to Porter (1936: 2): " . . . the curtain walls were not strong enough to support an earthen banquette. Moreover, unlike the bastion walls which were pointed with mortar only on the outside face, the curtain walls were pointed on both the outside and inside faces thereby showing that dirt was not banked up against them." A notation on the 1934 archeological plan reads: "The original mortar in the fort walls is of two different mixes. The mortar on the interior of the walls is about 50% lime and 50% sand. The mortar used for pointing up the exterior faces of the fort walls is 75% lime and 25% sand. Evidence was found that originally the entire fort walls were pointed on both exterior and interior faces except on the interior of the bastions. The interior of each bastion indicates they were probably originally filled with earth as they either are partially filled as in the south-west and south-east bastions or a very large amount of fill was found just in front of the bastions. In front of both the north-west and north-east bastions several feet of fill was found spread out over the ground. Also quite a lot being found in front of the other two bastions." It can be inferred that the fill was removed from the bastions when the fort was converted into a prison during the Revolution (Porter 1936: 3).

There is practically no information available about the artifacts which were recovered during the archeological excavations. "Antique fragments of china, glass, nails, buttons, etc. have been found in all parts of the fort except the bastions. Here nothing at all was found except a few wrought iron nails and two cannon balls in the south-west bastion. . . all brick fragments including glazed brick are definitely Colonial" (1934 archeological plan). Except for a few specimens on display in the visitor center at Fort Frederick, the present whereabouts

of the excavated artifacts is unknown. The map prepared by Porter suggests that very few artifacts (less than 125) were cataloged; perhaps only the more complete or unusual specimens were retained.

The Recent Proposal for Additional Reconstruction

In 1966 the Maryland Department of Forests and Parks prepared a proposal for further restoration and reconstruction at Fort Frederick. The proposal, based on research by William Brown, III, and associates of the reactivated First Maryland Regiment, is largely interpretive but reflects familiarity with the more readily available historical sources and with other mid-18th century fortifications. On the other hand, the proposal seems to reflect a willingness to accept some very vague and tenuous data as "the details necessary for a very reliable and accurate reconstruction."

The evidence for log magazines in both the southwest and northeast bastions is not conclusive. The only contemporary reference does refer to "magazines," but it was written by an officer who probably had little or no exact information about Fort Frederick (cited on p. 6). Historians usually refer to only one magazine, but this may be based on assumptions rather than on any facts known to them (Hamilton 1898; Lowdermilk 1878: 197; L. Wilson 1933: 6). By analogy with Fort Cumberland, Porter (1936: 2) also assumed there was only one magazine. The archeological excavations revealed a "thin layer of decayed wood" in the center of both the northeast and southwest bastions, both of which are slightly larger than the other two bastions. As the proposal for reconstruction recognizes, additional archeological exploration may provide some conclusive evidence about the number, location, construction, and size of the magazines.

The reconstructed catwalk, gate, and sentry boxes are planned entirely by analogy to those at other 18th century forts; it is possible that some historical and archeological (postmolds) evidence can be found.

The best available historical and archeological evidence suggest that the barracks were made of logs rather than stone as many historians have asserted. To the list of evidence cited in the proposal can be added the reference to "daubing and underpinning barracks" mentioned in an earlier section of this report (p. 9). Nevertheless, more conclusive evidence about the construction of the barracks is needed, especially since there is no direct evidence regarding the details of their superstructures. It is very probable that additional historical and architectural research, and possibly archeological research, would be very rewarding.

The proposal states that when the fort was used as a prison during the Revolutionary War "Many log huts were constructed on the parade to house the prisoners. Outside of the Fort, on ^{the} west side, a tower was constructed to watch over the prisoners." These statements need to be verified and amplified.

Recommendations for Additional Research

It should be emphasized at once that a completely accurate restoration of Fort Frederick is neither possible or desirable. The goal should be to make it accurate within the limits of surviving evidence, and to allow the park visitor the experience of reconstructing a part of the past in his own mind.

A thorough and carefully documented program of research should be undertaken in three principal areas: archeology, history, and architecture. Each of these have been previously investigated at Fort Frederick, but none appear to have been adequately or thoroughly researched in depth. All three are closely interrelated, but each requires its special skills to obtain the maximum amount of information. A team of three closely cooperating specialists is needed.

Archeology. The archeologist would act as principal investigator until the conclusion of the archeological and historical research when the project would be turned over to the architect for final decisions about the reconstruction. The archeologist should begin by attempting to recover as much information as possible about the excavations made in 1934-5. In addition to the records already supplied by the National Park Service, others may be available from the National Archives or in the old files of the Maryland State Department of Forestry. These data, as well as any artifacts that are available, should be carefully reviewed. Early photographs of the fort should be sought. Additional studies to be carried out by the archeologist before starting the excavations include a critical examination of the ground surface in the vicinity of the fort both from the ground and from aerial photographs. In the meantime, the historical

and preliminary architectural research should be nearing completion before archeological field work begins. Since it is impossible to determine beforehand how productive the archeological excavations may be, especially since there is no precise record of the previous investigations, the excavations should be of a preliminary nature. This will permit the correlation of the archeological, historical, and architectural data at an early time so it can be decided if more investigations are warranted. Test excavations should be made in various places within and outside the fort in order to determine the extent of the former excavations and to sample areas which may be undisturbed. More extensive investigations should be made in selected areas. For purposes of the preliminary study the main archeological work should be restricted to one of the bastions (either the southwest or northeast), and to one of the barrack foundations. In excavating the barracks the archeologist would be attempting to document details of their construction and to recover information overlooked by previous investigations. It would also be useful to search for a latrine or dump area that could be sampled for artifacts since few artifacts will probably be recovered elsewhere and since the available collections are apparently small and selective.

History. Previous historical research on Fort Frederick has emphasized its military and political significance and has relied primarily on the readily available sources reviewed in an earlier section of this report. Most of these are official documents which contain remarkably few of the kind of details needed for purposes of reconstruction. Apparently, little or no effort has been made to discover private correspondence, contemporary newspaper stories (for exception see

L. Hamilton 1898), diaries, and other sources which are more likely to contain descriptions of the fort as well as lengthy comments about various topics from which some insight into life at the fort can be obtained. Lists of supplies, expense accounts, inventories, and deeds frequently provide much useful information. The historical research should not be restricted to the earliest period of the fort because knowledge about its later appearance and modifications will contribute to an understanding of the original situation. An historian skilled in archival research is needed. Some obvious sources are the Papers of the Continental Congress at the Library of Congress and family histories and papers of men known to have been at Fort Frederick in the 18th century. Since the names of many of the persons connected with the early history of Fort Frederick are known, collections of their papers which may exist can be located through the finding indexes and descriptions of holdings which have been made available by many archives and libraries in recent years. Renewed efforts should be made to locate an early plan for the Fort since we know from one of Sharpe's letters (quoted, p. 4) that such a plan was in Annapolis shortly after Sharpe returned from beginning construction of the fort. The historian needs only to be familiar with archeology and architecture to the extent that he can recognize the types of information which may be useful to the archeologist and architect. Materials found can be xeroxed or transcribed and made available to the archeologist and architect for their study. It is important that the historian understand the context and circumstances in which various documents were produced since they reflect the way in which they came into being. A by-product of the historian's research could be a new and adequate history that would be a popular sales item at the Park's visitor center.

Architect. Architectural research on Fort Frederick has been carried on by historians. An architect who has studied 18th century military architecture would be in a much stronger position to design authentic reconstructions at Fort Frederick. Since we can not hope to learn every critical detail of the fort through archeological or historical research, inferences must be made by studying other mid-18th century forts for which information is available. The historian could aid the architect in learning more about Gov. Sharpe's background; it might even be possible to learn which books on military engineering were in Sharpe's personal library.

Tyler Bastian
Maryland Geological Survey
September, 1970

References

- Anonymous [J. T. Scharf?]
 1881 A Historic Spot, Fort Frederick and its many Interesting Associations. American, Aug. 29. Baltimore.
- Anonymous
 1924 Colonies' First Stone Fort. The Sunday Sun, Nov. 2. Baltimore.
- Archives
 1883-1964 Archives of Maryland. 70 vols. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.
- Bowie, Lucy Leigh
 1945 German Prisoners in the American Revolution. Maryland Historical Magazine, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 185-200.
- Brown, W. McCulloh
 1923 Fort Frederick. Maryland Historical Magazine, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 101-8.
 1929 "Fort Frederick": Its Ownership, and How Title was Twice Acquired by Maryland. Maryland Historical Magazine, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 176-81.
 1931 [not titled] Address to D.A. R. on occasion of presentation of four cannon to the State, Fort Frederick, May 2. Typescript in Enoch Pratt Free Library, Maryland Department, vertical files.
- Camper, Charles, and J. W. Kirkley
 1871 Historical Record of the First Regiment Maryland Infantry. Gibson Brothers, Washington.
- Fitzpatrick, John C. (editor)
 1925 The Diaries of George Washington, 1748-1799. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York. 4 vols.
 1931-34 Writings of George Washington from the Original Manuscript Sources, 1745-1799. 39 vols. Washington.
- Fort Frederick Bicentennial Committee
 1956 Fort Frederick Bicentennial . . . 1756-1956. [Hagerstown, Md.?]
- Greene, Daniel
 1967 Authentic, Scholarly, and Exciting: A Typical 1967 Indian Raid on a Fort. The National Observer, July 3.
- Hamilton, Leonore
 1898 The Historic Fort Frederick. American, Jan 30. Baltimore.
- Hamilton, Stanislaus Murray
 1898-1902 Letters to Washington and Accompanying Papers. 5 vols. Houghton, Mifflin and Company, New York.

- Kaessmann, Beta, Harold Randall Manakoe, and Joseph L. Wheeler
1955 My Maryland, Her Story for Boys and Girls. Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.
- Lowdermilk, Will H.
1878 History of Cumberland, (Maryland). . . James Anglin, Washington.
- McKinsey, Folger
1941 Historic Old Fort Frederick Mounument to Frontier Days. Sun, September 1. Baltimore.
- MacLachlan, Colin
1956 Fort Frederick Bicentennial to be Observed. [Sun?], May 1.
- McMahon, John V. L.
1831 An Historical View of the Government of Maryland . . . Lucas, Cushing and Neal, Baltimore.
- Mason, Mrs. Charles T.
[ca. 1910] There's Time to Save Fort Frederick. Newspaper clipping in Maryland Historical Socceity, vertical file.
- Mish, Mary Vernon
1956 Fort Frederick: The Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 123-4, 168. Washington, D. C.
- Musgrave, Arthur B.
1937 Fort Frederick Regains its Glory, CC Workers Restore Ancient Colonial Stronghold. Sunday Sun Magazine, May 23. Baltimore.
- Onderdonk, Henry
1872 A History of Maryland. John Murphy & Co., Baltimore.
- Porter, Charles W.
1936 Progress Report on Fort Frederick, SP-1, Md. Division of History, National Park Service, Washington, D. C. typescript.
- Scarborough, Katherine
1931 A Maryland Souvenir of Indian War. Sun, May 10. Baltimore.
- Scharf, J. Thomas
1879 History of Maryland from the Earliest Period to the Present Day. John B. Piet, Baltimore. 3 vols.

1882 History of Western Maryland. 2 vols. Louis H. Everts, Philadelphia.
- Steiner, Bernard C.
1902 Western Maryland in the Revolution. Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series 20, No. 1.
- Stevens, S. K., and D. E. Kent (editors)
1940-43 The Papers of Col. Henry Bouquet. 19 vols. Pennsylvania Historical Commission, Harrisburg.

Stockbridge, Henry

1895 Old Fort Frederick. The American Historical Register, o.s., vol. 2, pp. 748-54, 862-6. Philadelphia.

1914 Fort Frederick, Supplemental Notes. Typescript attached to a slightly abbreviated version of Stockbridge 1895. Enoch Pratt Free Library, Maryland Dept., vertical file.

W. McC. /probably W. McCulloh Brown, cited above/

1927 Fort Frederick, In Maryland, Was Part of Three Conflicts. Sunday Sun, August 14. Baltimore.

Williams, T. J. C.

1905 A Colonial Fort. Sunday Sun, March 26, p. 12. Baltimore.

1906 A History of Washington County Maryland, from the Earliest Settlements to the Present-Time. Reprinted 1968 by Regional Publishing Company, Baltimore.

Wilson, Leonore Hamilton

[1933] Fort Frederick, Washington County, Maryland, 1756. Stouffer Printing Co., Hagerstown, Md.

W. J. Q., Jr.

1934 Fort Frederick to be Restored. News Letter, Maryland State Department of Forestry, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 1-2.